



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/790,847

03/03/2004

Youenn Fablet

01807.101570.

2498

5514

7590

05/14/2008

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

ZAHR, ASHRAF A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/14/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/790,847	FABLET, YOUENN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	ASHRAF ZAHR	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is the final action on the merits for application number 10/790,847. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

### ***Response to Arguments***

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. Applicant Argues, “Lonnroth is seen to disclose the exchange of messages processed by clients to services, the messages being sent to pre-processors before reaching the service. Thus, the pre-processors read the messages and process it to generate a new message that the service can understand. The Office Action cited column 4, lines 32 to 36 of Lonnroth as allegedly teaching the features of Claim 1. However, in the cited portion of Lonnroth, the client is the one sending a request identifying a service and including a number of parameters. On the contrary, with the invention, the server that provides the service sends a service description document to the client”.

Lonnroth discloses, the XML document generated by pre-processor 240 in response to a service request is referred to herein as a XML request document. The XML request document includes links that identify the information sources that correspond to the requested service. As shall be described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that is used by the various components of post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 30-52). Therefore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant.

3. Applicant also Argues, "In Lonroth, when messages are sent from the client to the service, the service can check the validity of the message and whether it should be processed. This is in contrast to the invention of Claims 13 and 17 in which the client, and not the service, tests whether it will be able to interact correctly with the service. Thus, Claims 13 and 17, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are not believed to be anticipated by Lonroth".

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 13 and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Therefore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant.

4. Applicant also Argues, "As for Claims 14 and 18, Lonroth is not seen to teach the features of acquiring from a service description document at least one imperative value associated with a property of processing, and verifying whether the imperative value is included in a list of values which can be attributed to a property supported by the functionality described in the service description document".

Specifically, the XML document generated by pre-processor 240 in response to a service request is referred to herein as a XML request document. The XML request document includes links that identify the information sources that correspond to the requested service. As shall be described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that is used by the

various components of post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 30-52). Therefore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant.

## **FINAL REJECTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-12, 14-16, 18-19, 21-22, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lonnroth et al., US 6,826,597 (Hereinafter, Lonnroth).

**Regarding Claim 1**, Lonnroth discloses a “method of offering a service provided by a server computer in a communication network”. Specifically, Lonnroth discloses a method and system for allowing an arbitrary client to be serviced by a single application is described (Lonnroth, col 3, ln 49-51).

Lonnroth also discloses “comprising sending, from a server computer that provides a service to a client computer, a service description document describing a service”. Specifically, the XML document generated by pre-processor 240 in response

to a service request is referred to herein as a XML request document. The XML request document includes links that identify the information sources that correspond to the requested service. As shall be described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that is used by the various components of post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 30-52).

Lonnroth also discloses “the document comprising a description of a functionality implemented during a preprocessing or post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of said service on the communication network”. Specifically, As shall be described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that is used by the various components of post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 30-52)

**Regarding Claim 2**, Lonnroth discloses a “method according to Claim 1, wherein said functionality defines processings adapted to produce or use data in XML format defined in a first abstract part of a service description document”. Specifically, those request objects take the form of XML documents (Lonnroth, col 4 , ln 10-15).

**Regarding Claim 3**, Lonnroth discloses a “method according to Claim 2, wherein the description of said functionality is inserted in said first abstract part of the service description document”. Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the

client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonnroth, col 9, ln 32-37).

**Regarding Claim 4**, Lonnroth discloses a “method according to Claim 1, wherein said preprocessing or said post-processing is implemented via a script language”. Specifically, post processor has an XSL engine (Lonnroth, col 7, ln 40-50).

**Regarding Claim 5**, Lonnroth discloses a “method according to Claim 1, wherein said functionality is defined as a data item in XML format in a first abstract part of a service description document”. Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonnroth, col 9, ln 32-37).

**Regarding Claim 6**, Lonnroth discloses a “method according to Claim 5, wherein said data item in XML format defining said functionality is encoded in a second concrete part of the service description document”. Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonnroth, col 9, ln 32-37).

**Regarding Claim 7**, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 1, wherein the description of said functionality comprises a list of properties supported by said functionality, said properties defining at least respectively”(Lonroth, col 8, ln 21-37). Furthermore, Lonroth also discloses the style sheet for each device includes general instructions about how data should be formatted for the device (Lonroth, col 8, ln 39-52).

Lonroth discloses a “the node in the communication network adapted to execute said processing”. Specifically discloses a pre-processor and post-processor (col 4, ln 6-10).

Lonroth discloses a “the type of processing”. Specifically discloses XML processing (col 6, ln 1-10).

**Regarding Claim 8**, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 7, wherein said functionality also comprises a property adapted to specify whether said processing is carried out on the sending or reception of said message”. Specifically, the post-processor receives XML responses from the XML processor and a filtering unit selectively filters XML response documents based on filtering rules (Lonroth, col 7, ln 40-50).

**Regarding Claim 9**, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 7, wherein said functionality also comprises a property adapted to specify the message or a set of



messages to which said processing applies”. Specifically, XSL style sheets contain instructions about how each type of data item that can be contained in an XML document should be formatted prior to transmission to the client (Lonnroth, col 8, ln 20-25).

**Regarding Claim 10**, Lonnroth discloses a “method according to Claim 7, wherein said functionality also comprises a property adapted to define the data produced or used by said processing, and possibly the type of said data”. Specifically, XSL style sheets contain instructions about how each type of data item that can be contained in an XML document should be formatted prior to transmission to the client (Lonnroth, col 8, ln 20-25).

**Regarding Claim 11**, Lonnroth discloses a “method according to Claim 7, wherein the description of said functionality comprises a property adapted to specify whether the processing to be carried out is obligatory or optional”. Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

**Regarding Claim 12**, Lonnroth discloses a “method according to Claim 7, wherein, for at least one property supported by said functionality, the description of said functionality comprises a list of values attributable to said property”. Specifically, in one

embodiment, information about which services are authorized for each client are stored in a configuration database (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 28-30).

**Regarding Claim 14**, Lonnroth discloses a “method of validating a message received by an intermediate computer in a communication network, from a service description document comprising a description of a functionality implemented during a reprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of the message exchanged during the execution of a service on the communication network”. Specifically, such operations may include, for example, performing security checks to determine whether the client issuing the request is authorized to issue the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 25-30).

Lonnroth also discloses “extracting a processing from the message received”. Specifically, the pre-processor generates based on the request and information contained in configuration database, a request object in the form of an XML document (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 31-35).

Lonnroth also discloses “acquiring from said service description document at least one imperative value associated with a property of the processing”. Specifically, the pre-processor generates based on the request and information contained in configuration database, a request object in the form of an XML document (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 31-35).

Lonnroth also discloses “verifying whether said imperative value is included in a list of values which can be attributed to a property supported by said functionality

described in the service description document”. Specifically, the XML document generated by pre-processor 240 in response to a service request is referred to herein as a XML request document. The XML request document includes links that identify the information sources that correspond to the requested service. As shall be described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that is used by the various components of post processor 244 (Lonroth, col 5, ln 30-52).

**Regarding Claim 15**, Lonroth also discloses “reading the value associated with a property adapted to specify whether the processing is executed before or after the sending of said message”. Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

Lonroth also discloses “executing said processing when said value is adapted to specify that the processing must be executed before the sending of the message”. Specifically, the post-processor receives XML responses from the XML processor and a filtering unit selectively filters XL response documents based on filtering rules (Lonroth, col 7, ln 40-50).

**Regarding Claim 16**, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 1. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 1 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

**Regarding Claim 18**, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 14. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 14 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 14.

**Regarding Claim 19**, Lonroth also discloses “server computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of offering a service according to Claim 1” (Lonroth, Fig 2: node 110, col 5, ln 18).

**Regarding Claim 21**, Lonroth also discloses a “computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of validating a message according to Claim 14” (Lonroth, Fig 3, col 11, ln 7-8).

**Regarding Claim 22**, applicant claims a “computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of offering a service according to Claim 1”. This claim is substantially similar to claim 1 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

**Regarding Claim 24**, applicant claims a “computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of validating a message according to Claim 14”. This claim is substantially similar to claim 14 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 14.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 13,17,20,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lonroth et al., US 6,826,597 (Hereinafter, Lonroth).

**Regarding Claim 13**, Lonroth discloses a “method of testing access to a service by a client computer in a communication network, from a service description document, comprising the following steps implemented by said client computer”. Specifically, Lonroth discloses a method and system for allowing an arbitrary client to be serviced by a single application is described (Lonroth, col 3, ln 49-51).

Lonroth also discloses a “extracting a description of a functionality implemented during a preprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network”.

Specifically, XML gateways are mechanisms for converting between XML and messages produced by other types of data sources (Lonnroth, col 6, ln 8-10).

Lonnroth also discloses “reading a value associated with a property adapted to specify a node in the communication network adapted to execute the processing”. Specifically, the XML gateways that are called by XML processor in response to a particular XML request document are XML gateways that are connected to the data sources have the information identified in the XML request document (Lonnroth, col 6, ln 26-35).

Lonnroth also discloses a “reading a value of a property adapted to specify whether the processing is obligatory or optional”. Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

Lonnroth also discloses a “verifying whether the processing is supported by the client computer in the communication network when said processing is obligatory and must be executed by said client computer in the communication network”. Specifically, such operations may include, for example, performing security checks to determine whether the client issuing the request is authorized to issue the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 25-30).

Lonnroth does not specifically, disclose implementing all the steps above on the client device. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the steps on the client device. The motivation to do so is that Lonnroth states the set of services that may be requested by one client may be

different then service requested by another client (Lonnroth, col 4, ln 58-60). It would be obvious to verify the services at the client level to allow the client to only use the service that it requested and not another client requested.

**Regarding Claim 17**, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 13. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 13 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

**Regarding Claim 20**, Lonnroth also discloses a “client computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of testing access according to Claim 13” (Lonnroth, col 4, ln 30).

**Regarding Claim 23**, applicant claims a “computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of testing access according to Claim 13”. This claim is substantially similar to claim 13 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ASHRAF ZAHR whose telephone number is (571)270-1973. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AAZ 5/6/08

/William L. Bashore/  
William L. Bashore  
Primary Examiner  
Tech Center 2100